A proof, based on the <u>infinite descent method</u>, is contained in the textbook *Vollständige Anleitung zur Algebra* (St. Petersburg, 1770). It appears in Section, Chapter 12, under a title which can be translated as *On the transformation of this formula axx+cyy in squares, or also higher powers*.

\*\*\*\*

Capitel 12.

Bon der Bermandelung diefer Formel axx+cyy in Quadraten, ober auch hobere.

Poteftaten.

181.

Diefer Form axx + cyy öfters unmöglich ju Quadraten gemacht werden können: so oft es aber möglich ift, so kann diese Form in eine andere verwandelt werden, in welcher a=1 ift. 3. E. diese Form app-qq kann ein Quadrat werden, sie läßt sich aber auch solcher Gestalt vorstellen  $(ap+q)^2-a(p+q)^2$ . Sest man nun ap+q=x und p+q=y, so

The argumentation can be sketched as follows. Suppose for a contradiction that  $x^3 + y^3 = z^3$  for some nonzero integers x, y, z. Without loss of generality we may assume that x, y are coprime. Then two of the three numbers are odd, and one is even. Up to moving terms from one side to the other, we further may assume that x, y are odd. If we wish to restrict ourselves to the case where x, y are both positive, we will have to consider the equation  $x^3 - y^3 = z^3$  as well. This, however, as it will turn out in a moment, does not require a separate proof. Suppose that x > y. Let p, q be positive integers such that x = p + q, y = p - q. Then p, q are coprime, and we get

$$x^{3} + y^{3} = 2p(p^{2} + 3q^{2})$$
$$x^{3} - y^{3} = 2q(q^{2} + 3p^{2})$$

Thus it suffices to show that a number of the form  $2p(p^2+3q^2)$  is never a (perfect) cube. We may assume that p is even, so that q is odd (otherwise p and q would be exchanged, y would be replaced by -y and we would turn to the second equality). Once again, suppose for a contradiction that  $2p(p^2+3q^2)$  be a cube. Since p is even and the second factor is odd, it follows that p is divisible by 4. Moreover the product of integers  $\frac{p}{4}(p^2+3q^2)$  is a cube, too. We will only consider the case where the two factors are coprime. If they are not, the coprimality of p, q implies that their only positive non trivial common divisor is 3, so that 3|p and 3|q. If p=3r, then we get, as a new cube, the product of coprime integers  $\frac{9r}{4}(3r^2+q^2)$ , which can be handled in a similar way. Note that both factors  $\frac{p}{4}$  and  $p^2+3q^2$  are cubes. At this point, Euler claims the existence of two integers s, t such that

$$p + q\sqrt{-3} = (s + t\sqrt{-3})^3$$

$$p - q\sqrt{-3} = (s - t\sqrt{-3})^3$$
(1)

whence  $p^2 - 3q^2 = (s^2 + 3t^2)^3$ , and, moreover,

$$2p = 2s(s+3t)(s-3t)$$
$$q = 3t(s+t)(s-t)$$

Recall that 2p is a cube, and that p,q are coprime, which implies that so are s,t, and that  $3\not ks$ . On the other hand, since q is odd, t is odd and s is even. It follows that 2s, s+3t, s-3t are pairwise coprime, hence each of them is a cube. Let u,v be integers such that  $s+3t=f^3$ ,  $s-3t=g^3$ . Then the sum  $f^3+g^3=2s$  is a cube, say  $h^3$ . We have just found a new solution (f,g,h) to Fermat's equation, where f,g are odd and coprime, but |h|<|z|. This conclusion points at an (impossible) *infinite descent*.

A weak point in the above argumentation is the claim of the existence of two integers s,t fulfilling (1). The missing steps can actually be recovered by means of some arithmetic properties of the integers of the form  $a^2+3b^2$  presented by Euler in a memoir of 1760. A more elegant approach is based on the ring theory developed by Kummer and Dedekind in the following century. The main tool is the ring of integers of the number field  $\mathbb{Q}(\omega)$ , where  $\omega$  is a primitive cubic root of unity. One can exploit the fact that it is a UFD.